REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1, 3, 9 and 10 and cancels claims 2, 4-8 and 11. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1, 3, 9 and 10.

Request for Withdrawal of Finality of Rejection

In the Office Action mailed on August 22, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regard as the invention. The Examiner made the action FINAL. However, the Examiner's attention is directed to MPEP 706.07(a), which states:

> Under present practice, second or any subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims nor based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement filed during the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p).

Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is a new ground of rejection that was not necessitated by Applicants' amendment to the claims or based on information submitted in an information disclosure statement. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the finality of the Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner returned an initialed Form PTO-1449 with the August 22, 2005 Office Action. However, the Examiner both crossed through and initialed one of the references, Yanagihara, et al. "A research for proxy server with message rewriting function", Report of Kyoto Industrial University Computer Science Laboratory, Japan,

1998, vol. 14, no. 2, p. 85-106. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner clarify whether or not this reference has been considered.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the application does not disclose any structure that corresponds to the claimed means of "an individual action control means" and "an individual action storage means," as recited in claims 1-4 and 7-11; and "an access logging instruction means" and "a hierarchical execution means," as recited in claims 5 and 6. As indicated above, claims 2, 4-8 and 11 are cancelled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 2, 4-8 and 11 is moot. This rejection with respect to the remaining claims 1, 3, 9 and 10 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1, 3, 9 and 10 fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1, 9 and 10 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Logue, et al. ("Logue") in view of Cao, et al. ("Cao"), and further in view of Shrader. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claims 1, 9 and 10, are not taught or suggested by Logue, Cao or Shrader, whether taken individually or in combination

with each other, as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims so as to more clearly describe the features of the present invention. Specifically, the claims were amended to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to a communication proxy apparatus, as recited, for example, in claims 1, 9 and 10. These amendments do not change the scope of the claimed subject matter.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, provides a communication proxy apparatus including an access request agent and an individual action control agent. The access request agent is located in a communication path between a server device and a client device. The access request agent receives a request from the client device, another communication proxy apparatus, for access to information data located in the server device. The access request agent then forwards the request to the server device, or yet another communication proxy apparatus, obtains the requested information data and attribute information of the information data, and returns the data obtained from the server device to the client device. The individual access control agent includes an individual action storage, an individual action instruction agent and an individual action execution agent. The individual storage stores individual action definition information. The individual action definition information indicates a relationship between the information data and action information that indicates an action to be executed for the specific information data, and that indicates execution conditions of the action. The individual action instruction agent registers the individual action definition information in the individual

10

action storage. The individual action execution agent executes an individual action for the information data, based on the individual action definition information. The prior art does not teach or suggest all these features.

The above described features of the present invention, now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. More specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by either Logue, Cao or Shrader, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

Logue discloses a conventional proxy apparatus. However, as conceded by the Examiner, Logue does not teach or suggest an individual action execution agent for executing an individual action for the information data, based on the individual action definition information, as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Logue's conventional proxy apparatus includes a dispatcher 910, which is placed in a communication path between proxy servers 405 and a client 1. The dispatcher 910 receives a document request in the form of a URL from the client 1. Based upon the request, the dispatcher 910 determines which proxy server 405 contains the cached document, and forwards the client request to that proxy server 405. The appropriate proxy server 405 retrieves the document requested by the client 1. The response, which is typically in the form of an HTML document, is forwarded to the client.

The communications proxy apparatus, as recited in claims 1, 9 and 10, includes an individual action control agent. The individual action control agent has an individual action storage, an individual action instruction agent and an individual action execution agent. The individual action execution agent executes an individual

action for the information data obtained from the server device, based on the individual action definition information. As conceded by the Examiner, Logue does not teach or suggest a communication proxy apparatus having an individual action control agent, where the individual action control agent includes an individual action execution agent, as claimed. More specifically, Logue does not disclose an individual action execution means for executing an individual action for the information data obtained from the server device, based on individual action definition information, as claimed.

Therefore, as conceded by the Examiner, Logue fails to teach or suggest a computer proxy apparatus including an individual action control agent, where the individual action control agent includes: "an individual action execution agent for executing an individual action for the information data, which is the data obtained from the server device, based on the individual action definition information, under instructed conditions" as recited in the claims.

The above noted deficiencies of Logue are not supplied by any of the other references, particularly Cao. Therefore, combining the teachings of Logue with Cao still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Cao discloses a method of caching dynamic documents on the Web, by migrating parts of server processing on each user request to the caching proxy in a flexible, on-demand fashion via "cache applets." A cache applet is a server-supplied code attached with a Universal Resource Locator (URL) or a collection of URLs. In the Cao method, the server supplies cache applets attached to documents. The

12

method requires proxies to invoke cache applets upon cache hits to furnish the necessary processing without contacting the server.

Unlike the present invention, and as conceded by the Examiner, Cao does not teach or suggest a communication proxy apparatus having an individual action control agent, where the individual action control agent includes an individual action execution agent, as claimed. More specifically, Cao does not disclose an individual action execution means for executing an individual action for the information data obtained from the server device, based on individual action definition information, as claimed. In Cao, if a document requested by the client does not exist in the proxy's cache, then the proxy must obtain the document with the cache applet from the server. After obtaining the document and the cache applet, Cao's proxy saves a copy of the document and the cache applet in the cache, and returns the document to the client without invoking the attached cache applet. The proxy does not execute the cache applet unless the related document is found in the cache. This process differs from the present invention because it fails to take an individual action based on the individual action definition information, as claimed.

Therefore, Cao fails to teach or suggest a computer proxy apparatus including an individual action control agent, where the individual action control agent includes: "an individual action execution agent for executing an individual action for the information data, which is the data obtained from the server device, based on the individual action definition information, under instructed conditions" as recited in the claims.

13

The Examiner relies upon Shrader for teaching the above noted deficiencies of Logue and Cao. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the noted deficiencies of Logue and Cao are not supplied by any of the other references, particularly Shrader. Therefore, combining the teachings of Logue and Cao with Shrader still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Shrader teaches a system including a server and a client machine. The server has both data sources and action criteria defined by a user (column 3, lines 56-59). The user defines the data sources and the action criteria at the client machine (column 4, lines 18-19). The client performs a monitoring process to supply the user with specific data according to the user-defined action criteria.

In the present invention, a communication proxy apparatus includes its own action execution agent included within the communication apparatus. Therefore, each communication apparatus can add or change the services it can provide to users, without affecting the data in the server device. Shrader, on the other hand, does not disclose a communication proxy apparatus, as claimed. In Shrader, the client machine performs an action designated by a user when specific action criteria are met. The server holds both the data sources and the action criteria. As a result, the server would have to store the action criteria for as many different communication proxy apparatuses that would be needed.

Therefore, Shrader fails to teach or suggest a computer proxy apparatus including an individual action control agent, where the individual action control agent includes: "an individual action execution agent for executing an individual action for

14

the information data, which is the data obtained from the server device, based on the individual action definition information, under instructed conditions" as recited in the claims.

Logue, Cao and Shrader each suffer from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings Logue, Cao and Shrader in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1, 9 and 10. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1, 9 and 10 as being unpatentable over Logue in view of Cao, further in view of Shrader is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references used in the rejection of claims 1, 9 and 10.

Claims 2, 4, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Logue in view of Cao, further in view of Shrader, and even further in view of Amicangioli, and claims 5, 6 and 11 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Logue in view of Clinton. As indicated above, claims 2, 4-8 and 11 are cancelled. Therefore, the rejections with respect to claims 2, 4-8 and 11 are moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

15

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 9 and 10 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 520.40411X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/DM/sdb
(703) 684-1120

16